

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION**

<b>TIMOTHY DARNELL SECESSIONS,</b>	)	<b>CASE NO. 5:13 CV 195</b>
	)	
<b>Petitioner,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>v.</b>	)	<b>JUDGE DONALD C. NUGENT</b>
	)	
<b>WARDEN, LEBANON CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION,</b>	)	<b>Magistrate Judge Vecchiarelli</b>
	)	
<b>Respondent.</b>	)	<b><u>MEMORANDUM OPINION</u></b>

This matter is before the Court on the Report and Recommendation issued by Magistrate Judge Vecchiarelli. (Docket #16.) On January 23, 2013, Petitioner, Timothy Darnell Secessions, filed a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. (Docket #1.) Respondent filed a Motion to Dismiss the Petition on November 25, 2013 (Docket #10), asking the Court to dismiss the Petition, arguing Petitioner has failed to exhaust his administrative remedies. The Magistrate Judge recommends that the Petition be dismissed without prejudice to refiling. No objections to the Report and Recommendation have been filed.

**Standard of Review for a Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation**

The applicable standard of review for a magistrate judge's report and recommendation

depends upon whether objections were made to that report. When objections are made to a report and recommendation of a magistrate judge, the district court reviews the case *de novo*.

FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b) states:

The district judge must determine *de novo* any part of the magistrate judge's disposition that has been properly objected to. The district judge may accept, reject, or modify the recommended disposition; receive further evidence; or return the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions.

### **Conclusion**

This Court has reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation *de novo*, and finds it to be well-reasoned and correct. The Court ADOPTS the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (Docket #16) in its entirety. Respondent's Motion to Dismiss (Docket # 10) is GRANTED. The Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Docket #1) is DISMISSED without prejudice to refile. All pending motions are hereby terminated.

### **Certificate of Appealability**

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2253, the Court must determine whether to grant a certificate of appealability as to any of the claims presented in the Petition. 28 U.S.C. § 2253 provides, in part, as follows:

(c)(1) Unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability, an appeal may not be taken to the court of appeals from --

(A) the final order in a habeas corpus proceeding in which the detention complained of arises out of process issued by a State court; or

(B) the final order in a proceeding under section 2255.

(2) A certificate of appealability may issue under paragraph (1) only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.

(3) The certificate of appealability under paragraph (1) shall indicate which specific issue or issues satisfy the showing required by paragraph (2).

In order to make “substantial showing” of the denial of a constitutional right, as required under 28 U.S.C. § 2255(c)(2), a habeas prisoner must demonstrate “that reasonable jurists could debate whether . . . the petition should have been resolved in a different manner or that the issues presented were ‘adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further.’” *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 120 S. Ct. 1595, 146 L. Ed. 2d 542 (2000) (quoting *Barefoot v. Estelle*, 463 U.S. 880, 893 n.4, 103 S. Ct. 3383, 77 L. Ed. 2d 1090 (1983).)

Where a district court has rejected the constitutional claims on the merits, the petitioner must demonstrate only that reasonable jurists would find the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong. *Slack*, 529 U.S. at 484. Where the petition has been denied on a procedural ground without reaching the underlying constitutional claims, the court must find that the petitioner has demonstrated that reasonable jurists could debate whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right *and* that reasonable jurists could debate whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling. *Id.* “Where a plain procedural bar is present and the district court is correct to invoke it to dispose of the case, a reasonable jurist could not conclude either that the district court erred in dismissing the petition or that the petitioner should be allowed to proceed further.” *Id.*

For the reasons stated in the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation, a reasonable jurist could not conclude that dismissal of the Petition is in error or that Petitioner should be permitted to proceed further. Accordingly, the Court declines to issue a certificate of appealability.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Donald C. Nugent  
DONALD C. NUGENT  
United States District Judge

DATED: June 27, 2014